



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/005,969	11/06/2001	Soubhi Abdulkarim	42390P12804	2765
45459	7590	03/06/2006	EXAMINER	
GROSSMAN, TUCKER, PERREAUET & PFLEGER, PLLC C/O PORTFOLIO IP P. O. BOX 52050 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402				CHEN, TSE W
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2116		

DATE MAILED: 03/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

88

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/005,969	ABDULKARIM, SOUBHI
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Tse Chen	2116

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 16 February 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
 - a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 - b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 - (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 - (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1,4-8,11-14,17-20 and 23-29.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

See Continuation Sheet.
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
13. Other: _____.


LYNNE H. BROWNE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amended claim limitation of lowering a speed of a clock signal "based on the sleep message" does not further simplify or reduce the issue involving the previous unamended claim limitation of lowering a speed of a clock signal "corresponding with the sleep state" that corresponds to the sleep message.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant alleges that "it does not appear that Gregorian teaches that the clock speed is lowered..." Examiner disagrees and points to Applicant's admission that "Gregorian teaches that the mode of operation of the semiconductor chip changes in response to the clock speed" [pg.9 of Remarks dated 16 February 2006] which indicates that a communication protocol [mode] is changed in response to the lowering of a clock speed [i.e., CHANGE in protocol in response to CHANGE in clock speed inherently involves at least a clock speed that is relatively lower to another]. Applicant alleges that "the combined teachings of [Gregorian and Datta] would not yield a result that reads on Applicants' invention". Examiner disagrees and submits that one of ordinary skill in the art could alter the clock rate associated with the sleep state in Datta to any other clock rate suitable for the targeted system [different systems may have different clock rates associated with a sleep state] as Datta did not explicitly teach against such modifications [i.e., Datta is the base reference]. As such, Applicant's arguments are deemed not persuasive and the rejections are respectfully maintained.